



Bay Area Dioxins Project



Association of Bay Area
Governments

Summary of Discussions TASK FORCE MEETING JULY 16, 2001

Attending the meeting were:

Jennifer Krebs, ABAG Staff*
Gene Leong, ABAG Executive Director*
Michael McMillan, Port of Oakland*
Betsy Elzufon, LWA+
Kelly Moran, TDC Environmental+
Adam Garcia, Alameda County
Michael Kent, Contra Costa County Health Services
Sue Chiang, Greenaction
Michell Buzbee, LWA+
Catherine Porter, Women's Cancer Resource Center
Jay Murray, Murray and Associates
John Marshall, Chlorine Chemistry Council
Bill Wahbeh, Evergreen Oil
Eric Zell, Zell and Associates
Greg Karras, Communities for a Better Environment
Mike Green, Center for Environmental Health +
Katie Silberman, Center for Environmental Health +
Julie Weiss, City of Palo Alto*
Niko Letunic, City of Oakland*
Brooke Levin, City of Oakland*
Andrew Clark-Clough, City of Oakland*
Mark Westlund, City and County of San Francisco
Pamela Evans, Alameda County*

(+ task force consultant, * task force member)

Welcome/Introductions

Jennifer Krebs convened the meeting and welcomed task force members and the public. It was noted that there would be no formal meeting minutes taken, that the task force has operated by consensus, and that notes would be posted on the website.

Public Comment Period (notes by Katie Silberman, CEH)

Greg Karras, Communities for a Better Environment

- Move forward.
- Industries have direct \$ interest.
- 5/8 comments on draft screening:
- Comparison of data recommends:
Enough data to act now.
- Info. Re: risk assessment should be removed/contrary to pollution prevention.
- Attempt to quantify sources should be removed.
- Instead: -is it a source?
 - can we act?
 - do we have info we need?
- Other sources should be added.
- Residential wood burning not a source-should be investigated.
- Medical waste and oil refining should be highest priorities.
- Need for body burden monitoring.

Predominant sources are industrial- other agencies have jurisdiction i.e. EPA, air district, and should receive report.

-Policy dictates move forward now.

Sue Chiang, Greenaction:

-transparent process is encouraging.

-focus on pollution prevention, not control.

Screening Evaluation Status

The task force received many comments on this document and the consultant, Dr. Kelly Moran, is still reviewing the comments. It is not anticipated that the findings will change, rather that new information will be added. When the draft final version is complete, it will be posted on the website. Target date- September 2001

P2 Project Selection by Local Government Agencies

Kelly Moran and Betsy Elzufon ran the group through four possible P2 projects outlined in a memo (attachment 1). A discussion on the merits of each project for local agencies occurred as each project was presented. Some comments from the discussion included:

Medical waste – Concern was raised that a medical waste project would require staff from departments in local government other than those around the table. That this need for widespread local government participation would be a barrier for the project. Other participants noted that this project would dovetail with current efforts by the Hospital Pollution Prevention Project. Project to be developed further by consultants.

Paper – Interest was expressed in seeing a purchasing pool for PCF paper initiated. This will regionalize the project and provide positive pr for the project. Project to be developed further by consultants, specifically focusing on the purchasing pool and purchasing specifications.

PVC in construction. – Interest was expressed in this project by several people and a question was raised as to how this project could be integrated in other ongoing green building projects. Project to be developed further by consultants.

Wood burning – The discussion centered on whether local governments could do more in this arena than what is already being done with incentives and assistance from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Consultant will not develop this concept further at this time.

Next steps – Projects will be selected at the next meeting (September 12, 1:00 pm)

A request was made for more information to be developed – a project concept – on diesel alternatives.

Public Outreach Report

Progress Report Memo from Mike and Katie was distributed. (attachment 2) It was announced that there is currently no additional funding for a continuation of the grant for CEH for next year. In September, the current contract with CEH runs out. The report should be completed by then. Any comments should be addressed to Mike.

Budget update

Jennifer distributed the current operating budget for the project (attachment 3)

Public Comment Period

Bill Wabbeh, Evergreen Oil:

-Evergreen stopped burning halogenated fuel.

Jay Murray, Murray & Assoc.:

-Watch actual impact on dioxins in Bay Area.

- project should get the most “Bang for the buck”

-Chosen projects will have least impact:

-paper mills aren’t here-compare with EPA recs.

-PVC pipes may reduce copper exposure (transport of water).

-These options won’t reduce dioxin, and may have a greater environmental impact.

-Do deal with residential wood burning and diesel fuel.

Eric Zell, Zell & Assoc.:

- Wood burning is top source in Bay Area.
- A wood burning project is a viable role for government, i.e. education and financial incentives.
- Doesn't make sense not to put money into public education.
- Air District program on wood burning is limited; putting money here would make a difference.

Sue Chiang, Greenaction:

- Industrial interests deflect attention from industry sources.
- Medical waste project could make a difference.
- Paper project would have an impact.
- Important to pursue non-PVC.
- Wood burning not effective without pollution prevention to get dioxin out of the wood in the first place.

Adjournment

Next meeting September 12, 1:00 ABAG Metrocenter auditorium



MEMO

TO: Bay Area Dioxins Project Participants
FROM: Kelly D. Moran
SUBJECT: Possible Pollution Prevention Projects

DATE: July 9, 2001
PROJECT: 23

To facilitate discussion of possible dioxins pollution prevention projects to be implemented by the Bay Area Dioxins Project, Betsy Elzufon from Larry Walker Associates and I have prepared several specific project concepts. These are DRAFTS that should be considered examples of possible projects.

We anticipate that more than one project will be conducted—depending on the interests of project participants, as many as three projects are possible. We selected this group of projects to start with based on your preliminary feedback to us about project interests. To ensure that a good mix of projects is selected we have presented project options that involve different types of participants—various industries, commercial businesses and institutions, residents, and municipal staff. The project descriptions show how a project would play out for each of these different audiences. The descriptions also provide information about what participating municipalities would need to do and what role the project consulting team (TDC Environmental and Larry Walker Associates) would play in the projects.

We will be discussing project selection at the upcoming meeting on July 16th. As you review these draft descriptions in preparation for the meeting, I ask that you think about the following:

- What comments do you have on these project design concepts (in general and specific to each concept)?
- If you are interested in the paper or wood burning project concepts, which of the possible project approaches do you prefer?
- Are there other types of projects that you would like us to draft for consideration of the group?
- Do you anticipate needing any specific additional information (other than the report and the project concept descriptions) to help your municipality decide on projects?
- Which projects seem most interesting to your municipality? (Note: at this point, we're looking for preliminary interest, not a commitment to participation.)

Medical Waste Project Option

Purpose: Reduce incineration of medical waste.

Background: The Healthcare Pollution Prevention Project (HCP2 Project), a cooperative effort among numerous entities including the California Department of Health Services (DHS), Cal-EPA, USEPA, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, Healthcare Without Harm affiliate organizations, and several San Francisco Bay Area hospitals, has developed methods to promote pollution prevention at hospitals and a strong network to support hospital pollution prevention activities. The project has focused on reducing mercury use, solid waste, and medical waste. Although it has developed powerful methods to achieve significant reduction in medical waste volumes, the HCP2 Project has not specifically dealt with medical waste management options selected by participating hospitals.

Incineration is among a variety of on-site and off-site medical waste management options available to San Francisco Bay Area hospitals. While California law requires that wastes comprising 2-8% of the medical waste stream (pathological, pharmaceutical, and chemotherapy wastes) be incinerated, hospitals are free to select among other DHS-approved technologies for management of their remaining medical waste. Among the many available options, commonly employed alternatives include on-site use of autoclaves and off-site treatment by microwave or autoclave. Although some information on alternatives exists, no convenient, California-specific information about medical waste management alternatives, costs, vendors, and regulatory requirements is available to Bay Area hospital managers.

California has only one medical waste incinerator, operated by Integrated Environmental Systems (IES) in Oakland. IES also offers off-site treatment of medical waste management by microwave and autoclave. The community surrounding IES has repeatedly expressed its concerns about the presence of the incinerator. When DHS prohibited IES from accepting waste for incineration for 30 days this summer, wastes were shipped out of state for incineration. Recent medical waste management permit compliance problems at the IES incinerator have created uncertainty regarding California's medical waste incineration capacity and are likely to prompt hospital interest in alternatives for medical waste management.

Summary of Public Comments on a Medical Waste Project:

| Pro | Con | Comment | Commenter |
|-----|-----|---|---|
| X | | Supports a medical waste project (2 specifically an incineration project) | Arnold, Jan Breast Cancer Fund, Joan Reinhardt Reiss Commonweal, Davis Baltz Communities for a Better Environment, Greg Karras Ford, Marilee Health and Environmental Justice Project, Jay Mendoza Health Care Without Harm/American Nurses Association, Ann Melamed Institute for the Study of Health and Illness at Commonweal, Mary Wade Knapp, B. V. Thimmakka's Resources, Ritu Primlane Greenaction, Bradley Angel and Susan Chiang |
| X | | Supports a project that builds on the Healthcare Pollution Prevention project | Health Care Without Harm/American Nurses Association, Ann Melamed |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| X | | Medical waste management alternatives are feasible--Stanford, Alta Bates and Alameda have committee to moving away from incineration for a majority of their medical wastes | Greenaction, Bradley Angel and Susan Chiang |
| X | | Medical waste project should call for ending incineration (good alternatives exist), eliminating state requirement to incinerate 2-5% of medical waste, consult with Jorge Emmanuel, regional resident and national expert on alternatives to medical waste incineration | Health Care Without Harm/American Nurses Association, Ann Melamed |
| X | | Wants local governments to help IES to transition to a non-combustion technology | Commonweal, Davis Baltz Ford, Marilee Institute for the Study of Health and Illness at Commonweal, Mary Wade Thimmakka's Resources, Ritu Primlane Communities for a Better Environment, Greg Karras and Ethel Dotson Greenaction, Bradley Angel and Susan Chiang |
| X | | Supports efforts to terminate incineration at IES, due to environmental justice concerns | Health Care Without Harm/American Nurses Association, Ann Melamed Arnold, Jan |
| X | | Concerned about releases from IES medical waste incinerator and industries in Contra Costa County | Lupo, Jeffrey |
| | | A medical waste project is OK (disposal choice) | Abbot (Perclose), Sean Murphy and Barbara Ortega |

Scope: Building on the existing HCP2 Project, this project would entail developing information on medical waste management alternatives for hospital and promoting voluntary conversion of medical waste management from incineration to an alternative technology. Since this could be a relatively significant change for some hospitals, the recommended project design involves technical assistance and support for hospitals that are willing to consider changes in medical waste management practices.

The project would involve the following steps:

- Form project-specific municipality and agency team (Project Work Group). This team would ideally be coordinated with the existing HCP2 Project participants. The team would meet monthly or bimonthly for the duration of the project to review and comment on consultant work products, to plan and conduct training events, and to resolve issues identified during project implementation. The consultant team would form the group, organize meetings, and keep brief meeting notes.
- Develop convenient, California-specific information about medical waste management alternatives, costs, vendors, and regulatory requirements available to Bay Area hospital managers. The consultant team would conduct this work, with input from the Project Work Group.
- Train staff from participating municipalities about medical waste management alternatives and hospital pollution prevention. The consultant team would arrange training event(s) and lead the training elements regarding medical waste management. It is expected that experts from DHS and other agencies, hospitals, municipalities, and HCP2 participants would provide training on other hospital pollution prevention elements.

- Implement the project. Options for municipality participation:
 - Join HCP2 group and work to implement pollution prevention (including medical waste diversion from incineration) at one or more local hospitals and/or at municipality-operated healthcare facilities.
 - Obtain training and information from HCP2 group on one or more elements of hospital pollution prevention and promote healthcare pollution prevention (including medical waste diversion from incineration) through existing municipality pollution prevention or environmental inspection programs [Note: This option will be most effective if DHS or another HCP2 participant is available to follow up on referrals; DHS availability may be limited.]
 - Conduct a one-time local program to encourage one or more local hospitals and/or municipality-operated healthcare facilities to manage medical waste (other than those waste for which incineration is required) by means other than incineration. Such a program would likely involve municipality staff and management contacts with hospitals as well as providing technical information and hospital-specific assistance in reviewing and evaluating alternatives.

The consultant team would provide support to municipalities for their implementation efforts regarding medical waste management options. [*The specific level of support provided by consultants needs to be determined as each municipality evaluates its participation and will be a major factor in determining the project budget.*]

- Evaluate the project and prepare a case study. With the assistance of participating municipalities and hospitals, the consultant team would evaluate the project and prepare a written case study.

A possible additional element of the project (that could not be funded by the USEPA grant) would be to work with other entities and a Bay Area legislator to pursue the legislative changes necessary to provide DHS with the discretion to approve non-incineration methods for management of the small amount of medical waste that currently must be incinerated.

Potential barriers and issues: This design assumes that the HCP2 work group would be interested in partnering on this project and that DHS will have sufficient staff available to support these activities [*Note: preliminary feedback from the HCP2 work group and DHS is positive*]. It can be difficult to get the attention of hospitals, whose energies are focused on financial problems, labor issues, and patient care.

Products:

- A handout or brochure providing convenient, California-specific information about medical waste management alternatives, costs, vendors, and regulatory requirements available to Bay Area hospital managers. The handout would be suitable for photocopying and for electronic distribution (via e-mail or posting on the Internet).
- Training for municipality staff on medical waste management alternatives and other elements of hospital pollution prevention.
- Project case study

Schedule:

| Activity | Schedule |
|---|---|
| Form project-specific municipality and agency team | 1 st Quarter, meet monthly or bimonthly throughout project |
| Develop technical, regulatory and cost information on medical waste management alternatives | 1 st Quarter |
| Train participants about medical waste management alternatives and hospital pollution prevention | 2 nd Quarter |
| Work with municipalities and hospitals to promote adoption of medical waste management alternatives and hospital pollution prevention actions | 3 rd -4 th Quarter |
| Evaluate results and prepare case studies | 5 th Quarter |

Budget (estimate): Depends on workplan details; a \$20,000 to \$30,000 budget is likely (this estimate assumes that simple handouts would be prepared; it does not include graphic design, layout, or printing of materials).

Implementing Municipality(ies): *[To be determined]*

Paper Project Option

Purpose: Expand purchases of process chlorine free (PCF) recycled paper to replace purchases of paper bleached by other methods.

Background: Municipality paper use typically includes copy paper, letterhead, paper for outsourced printing, business cards, office supplies (like envelopes, note paper, and pads), and hygienic papers (paper towels, tissues, and toilet paper). Most—if not all—of the municipalities participating in the Bay Area Dioxins Project have purchasing preferences for recycled paper. Some of the municipalities, including Palo Alto, San Francisco, and Berkeley *[is this list complete?]* have been purchasing at least some PCF¹ paper on a routine basis. Some private businesses in the Bay Area also use PCF paper, but PCF paper use is not widespread.

Opportunities to expand purchases of PCF paper include actions that make PCF paper purchasing easier (model purchasing specifications for various types of paper products, vendor lists), promoting PCF purchases to others (workshop, educational materials), or developing a paper purchasing pool for selected paper types (e.g., copy paper, toilet paper) to obtain reduced prices for identical products purchased by many municipalities.

PCF paper purchasing is a relatively easy to implement dioxins pollution prevention measure, because it involves actions by a relatively small number of municipality staff. A PCF paper purchasing project can easily be designed to raise municipal staff awareness of dioxins issues (since most use paper products, simply a memorandum notifying staff of the reason for the change would be an educational tool).

Summary of Public Comments on a Paper Project:

| Pro | Con | Comment | Commenter |
|-----|-----|--|---|
| X | | Supports a PCF/TCF paper project | Commonweal, Davis Baltz Ford, Marilee Institute for the Study of Health and Illness at Commonweal, Mary Wade Thimmakka's Resources, Ritu Primlane Health and Environmental Justice Project, Jay Mendoza |
| | X | Opposes project on TCF paper, as won't reduce dioxins in SF Bay area and (per USEPA data) reductions would be small nationally, ECF is better technology | Murray & Associates, Jay Murray |

Scope: Several options are available for design of a paper purchasing project. The scope would depend on the project design selected by the participating municipalities. Options include:

- Develop and use tools to facilitate PCF paper purchasing by individual municipalities. Such tools include PCF paper purchasing specifications and vendor lists for various types of paper products purchased by municipalities. Project consultants could develop these tools and could also provide technical support for the purchasing process (e.g., review bids). Municipality purchasing staff would need to review, approve, and use purchasing specifications. Affected municipality staff (like photocopy shop staff) may need to test papers. Additional background information relevant to conversion to PCF paper (e.g., a set of “frequently asked questions” and answers about price, paper appearance, and

¹ PCF paper is the “chlorine-free” bleaching option for recycled paper.

paper functionality for uses like photocopying; or a model staff report to support a PCF paper purchasing preference) could also be compiled by project consultants for municipality use.

- Promote PCF paper purchasing to others. Conduct an educational effort to encourage private businesses and institutions to use PCF paper. Since such conversions would be voluntary, the project would need to be carefully designed to maximize the effectiveness of the campaign, *e.g.*, by focusing on a specific target audience, by providing tools to make PCF paper purchasing easy, and possibly by including an element of recognition (positive feedback) for entities that purchase PCF paper. Possible target audiences for such a campaign include large private businesses, municipality contractors, or printing and photocopying shops. The effort could involve a variety of approaches, such as individual interactions with companies, presentations at industry association meetings, letters from senior officials to corporate/institutional leaders, and/or a high-visibility workshop [Note: the Chlorine-Free Products Association (CFPA) has offered to work with the Bay Area Dioxins Project to put on a workshop]. If the workshop option is selected, community awareness would be raised and it would provide a vehicle for publicity for the Bay Area Dioxins Project's efforts. All of these activities would involve municipal staff actions, with technical and organizational support provided by consultants.
- Set up a PCF paper purchasing pool. The principal goal of a PCF paper purchasing pool would be to conduct pooled purchasing of selected paper products on behalf of municipalities who voluntarily join the pool. Pooled purchasing enables municipalities to achieve more competitive pricing from suppliers who are interested in larger purchases and making larger shipments to one geographic area. Issues to be explored by project consultants to assist municipality consideration of development of a purchasing pool include management of the pool (select the entity that would be the fiscal agent), identification of products where pooled purchases would be feasible given individual municipality purchasing requirements, and potential cost savings available from pool—rather than individual—purchasing.

Potential barriers and issues: Industry representatives have opposed adoption of PCF paper purchasing preferences. PCF paper sources are somewhat limited and papers are generally more expensive.

Products: *[Products would depend on the selected project design, but could include model purchasing specifications, sample press releases, vendor lists, model staff reports, technical support documents, etc.]*

Schedule: *[Depends on selected project design.]*

Budget (estimate): *[Depends on selected project design—a paper project should be able to be done for \$15,000 to \$30,000.]*

Implementing Municipality(ies): *[To be determined]*

Wood Burning Project Option

Purpose: Reduce residential wood burning.

Background: Wood burning is one of the few ordinary residential activities that directly cause dioxins to be formed. In the Bay Area, wood burning is primarily for aesthetic purposes. When wood is burned in fireplaces, dioxins are emitted to the air; dioxins also remain in the ash. The dioxins emissions come from a combination of dioxins in the wood itself—accumulated from the wide variety of national and international dioxins emission sources—and dioxins formed from chlorinated compounds in the wood. While the dioxins and the chlorine in the wood come from both natural and human sources, human activities are probably the major source.

Although there is limited data regarding the relative importance of wood burning as a dioxins source, wood burning is a potentially significant Bay Area dioxins source. USEPA is conducting additional studies of wood combustion that should provide better dioxins emissions estimates in 2002. Fireplaces are known to be a major source of fine particulate matter emissions (PM₁₀), and toxic air pollutants like benzo(a)pyrene (which is on the Great Lakes list of priority persistent, bioaccumulative toxic substances). Concern about these pollutants is the primary motivation for most educational and regulatory programs to reduce residential wood burning.

Currently, there are probably a million or more fireplaces in the Bay Area, so the potential scope of a wood-burning project is quite large. In general, attempting to communicate pollution prevention messages directly to a large, diverse audience like Bay Area residents is expensive. General public education programs have not proven especially effective in achieving widespread behavior change.² Other available options to reduce wood burning (such as building ordinance restrictions and cooperating with industry associations to promote wood burning unit conversions) have proven effective elsewhere.

Summary of Public Comments on a Wood Burning Project:

| Pro | Con | Comment | Commenter |
|-----|-----|--|---|
| X | | Supports a wood-burning fireplace project that includes education and outreach, financial incentives for natural gas conversions, and adoption of ordinances containing provisions like the BAAQMD model ordinance (1 does not like idea of outlawing residential wood burning (impractical), but thinks this is a good source to work on) | Contra Costa Council, Jim Jakel Partnership for Sound Science in Environmental Policy, Craig Johns |
| X | | Supports a project on residential wood burning | Murray & Associates, Jay Murray |
| | X | Opposes selection of project to ban or restrict individual resident's use of fireplaces, because it is not P2 (only keeping chlorine out of wood would be P2); however, other good reasons to work on wood burning (air pollution); thinks a residential wood burning project is impractical | Communities for a Better Environment, Greg Karras and Ethel Dotson |
| | X | Opposes selection of project to ban or restrict individual resident's use of fireplaces, because it makes consumers responsible for dioxins P2 rather than industry | Commonweal, Davis Baltz Ford, Marilee Thimmakka's Resources, Ritu Primlane |

² A residential education campaign would have benefits, such as increase residents' awareness of dioxins issues and giving individuals something that they can do.

Scope: *[Need input from BAAQMD]* Since wood burning is a very diffuse activity, a pollution prevention project must be designed to target a specific audience or opportunity. Possible project designs include (but are not limited to):

- Adopt BAAQMD Ordinance. One or more participating municipalities could propose to adopt the BAAQMD model fireplace ordinance, which prohibits new open fireplaces, burning of problem fuels, and burning on “Spare the Air” nights. The municipalities could adopt the ordinance in its entirety or in a modified form to meet local needs. The project consulting team would provide municipalities with a copy of the model ordinance, copies of versions adopted by other Bay Area municipalities, copies of staff reports from those municipalities, and (if desired) additional background information or a model staff report to assist with ordinance adoption. The consulting team could also be available to provide technical support for staff meetings with planning/building staff and decision makers. The municipality planning/building and environmental staff would need to work together on ordinance adoption (make modifications if needed; prepare staff report and take ordinance to board, commission, or council for approval; and probably meet with interested parties). The planning/building department would need to implement the ordinance provisions involving construction (usually the other provisions are not formally implemented).
- Promote installation of natural gas fireplaces to replace wood fireplaces. There are several options for design of a program to promote natural gas fireplace retrofits. Probably the most effective design would be to provide a financial incentive for fireplace conversions. Alternatively, an educational program conducted to focus specifically on residents considering fireplace conversion or household renovation could be effective, especially if conducted in partnership with vendors of natural gas fireplaces or building industry partners.

These project designs would generally involve the following approach:

- Form project-specific municipality and agency team (Project Work Group). The team would meet monthly or bimonthly for the duration of the project to review and comment on consultant work products and to resolve issues identified during project implementation. This project would probably be more effective if conducted in partnership with the BAAQMD, which would be asked to join the project work group. The consultant team would form the group, organize meetings, and keep brief meeting notes.
- Implement the project. *[Details depend on project option selected.]*
- Evaluate the project and prepare a case study. With the assistance of participating municipalities, the consultant team would evaluate the project and prepare a written case study.

Potential barriers and issues: Developers have opposed the adoption of the BAAQMD model ordinance in some locations, although opposition has generally been less than anticipated. The ordinance only affects new development, so it does not generally serve to reduce emissions. High natural gas costs may be a barrier to fireplace conversions. Given the cost of natural gas fireplaces, an effective financial incentive may be costly for participating municipalities. Environmental advocates have indicated concern about a project regarding fireplaces, because they fear the project would have limited effectiveness and because such a project would not deal with human sources of chlorine in wood.

Products: *[Depends on selected project elements, but could include model ordinance, sample press releases, technical support documents, natural gas fireplace information brochure and vendor list.]*

Schedule: *[The schedule would depend on selected project elements. In general, the best time to implement a fireplace campaign will be in the fall and winter.]*

Budget (estimate): *[Depends on selected project elements. For example, development of model ordinance, supporting documentation, and technical assistance for two municipalities considering ordinance adoption would cost \$15,000-\$20,000. A public outreach campaign would cost \$50,000 or more.]*

Implementing Municipality(ies): *[To be determined]*

PVC in Buildings Project Option

Purpose: Reduce use of PVC-containing building materials and office products.

Background: PVC products are practically ubiquitous in buildings and offices, appearing as building siding, flooring, windows, gutters, electrical cable coating, window coverings, furniture, computers, non-potable water piping, and notebooks. Dioxins are released from PVC manufacturing (which does not occur in the Bay Area) and from combustion of PVC-containing materials, such as in a building fire.³

Purchasing of PVC-free office products is a relatively easy-to-implement dioxins pollution prevention measure, because it involves actions by a relatively small number of municipality staff. Selecting alternatives to PVC building products would have the potential to eliminate use of larger quantities of PVC, but would typically require cooperation among several departments within a municipality.

Summary of Public Comments on a PVC in Buildings Project:

| Pro | Con | Comment | Commenter |
|-----|-----|---|--|
| X | | Supports a project on PVC alternatives for building materials (1 would like to see contractors take a pledge, with a specific time goal, to eliminate PVC use; educate architects to eliminate PVC use) | Breast Cancer Fund, Joan Reinhardt Reiss Commonweal, Davis Baltz Ford, Marilee Institute for the Study of Health and Illness at Commonweal, Mary Wade Thimmakka's Resources, Ritu Primlane Women's Cancer Resource Center, Catherine Porter Unger, Zachary |
| X | | Supports a project that would involve developing a list of vendors of alternative products (think this means PVC); Greenpeace PVC web site is a good resource for information on non-PVC alternatives | Brook, Lena |
| X | | Supports a PVC project (general) | Health and Environmental Justice Project, Jay Mendoza |
| X | | Concerned about firefighter exposures to dioxins from PVC in building fires | Unger, Zachary |
| | X | Opposes PVC in building construction project, as would have limited impact on SF Bay Area dioxins emissions and small impact at manufacturing sites elsewhere | Murray & Associates, Jay Murray |

Scope: Conduct a demonstration project that creates tools to facilitate selection of alternatives to PVC-containing building or office products by municipalities, and demonstrates the use of those tools in purchasing materials for one or more participating municipalities.

The project could involve some or all of the following steps:

- Form project-specific municipality and agency team (Project Work Group). This team would ideally be coordinated with participants in local, regional and/or national green building programs (such as the Healthy Building Network, U.S. Green Building Council, alternative product vendor organizations and architects). The team would meet monthly or bimonthly for the duration of the project to

³ The relative contribution of PVC-building material combustion to dioxins production in building fires is uncertain, as the presence of PVC (as opposed to an alternative) changes both the chlorine content of the fire and the combustion conditions of the fire (which may make dioxins formation either more or less likely).

review and comment on consultant work products, to plan and conduct any workshop or vendor events, and to resolve issues identified during project implementation. The consultant team would form the group, organize meetings, and keep brief meeting notes.

- Select building and/or office products that will be the focus of the project. Project consultants would select the products that the project would target with assistance from the Project Work Group.
- Develop convenient, Bay Area-specific information about selected alternatives to PVC-containing products, including pros and cons, costs, and vendors. The consultant team would conduct this work, building on existing information from regional green building programs and municipality demonstration projects, with input from the Project Work Group.
- Develop purchasing specifications for selected products and test with one or more municipalities. Project consultants could develop purchasing specifications and could also provide technical support for the purchasing process (e.g., review bids). Additional background information relevant to use of PVC alternatives (e.g., a set of “frequently asked questions” and answers or a model staff report) could also be compiled by project consultants for municipality use. Purchasing staff would need to review, approve, and use purchasing specifications. Facilities staff would probably want to participate in specification development for building materials and would probably need to approve selection of alternative materials. Future building occupants may wish to be involved in building material selection.
- Hold a vendor event to promote alternatives to municipalities and to Bay Area designers. Such an event could raise community awareness and it would provide a vehicle for publicity for the Bay Area Dioxins Project’s efforts. Such an event could include other dioxin alternative products (like PCF paper products). A vendor event could be organized by the project consultants, with assistance of the Project Work Group.
- Evaluate the project and prepare a case study. With the assistance of participating municipalities, the consultant team would evaluate the project and prepare a written case study.

Potential barriers and issues: It is often difficult to determine which products contain PVC. For certain products, alternatives may be difficult to find in the marketplace or more expensive.

Products:

- A list of alternatives to selected common PVC-containing building products, vendors, and costs.
- Model purchasing specifications for one or more alternative products
- Workshop or vendor event
- Project case study

Schedule:

| Activity | Schedule |
|---|---|
| Form project-specific municipality and agency team | 1 st Quarter, meet monthly or bimonthly throughout project |
| Select list of products that will be the focus of the project | 1 st Quarter |
| Obtain materials information, vendor lists, and cost information. | 2 nd Quarter |
| Develop model purchasing specification for one or more alternatives | 2 nd -3 rd Quarter |
| Implement purchasing demonstration with one or more municipalities | 3 rd -4 th Quarter |
| Conduct workshop or vendor event to promote alternatives | 5 th Quarter |
| Evaluate results and prepare case studies | 5 th Quarter |

Budget (estimate): Depends on workplan details; a \$20,000 to \$30,000 budget is likely.

Implementing Municipality(ies): *[To be determined]*

Attachment 2

PROGRESS REPORT MEMO

To: ABAG Bay Area Dioxins Project Task Force
From: Katie Silberman and Mike Green, Public Participation Coordinators
Date: July 23, 2001
Re: Report on Public Participation Process

Dear Task Force:

We would like to update you on the progress of the Bay Area Dioxins Project Public Participation Process. The Project held a public meeting on April 26, 2001, with written comments submitted until May 10. Our goals for the process were to ensure that all concerned constituencies were reached out to and listened to, and their comments seriously evaluated for inclusion into the draft document or decision-making process. Our strategy for accomplishing this included massive outreach through phone calls, mailed brochures, mailed postcards, and personal meetings with interested parties.

The public participation strategy that CEH implemented under the task force's direction has been very successful to date. Some indicators of this success include:

- Attendance at initial meetings for the public participation process
- Strong attendance at the public hearing
- Numerous spoken and written comments received
- Feedback from community groups, industry groups, environmental groups and Task Force members that they felt the process was fair and went well

I. The Process

CEH began our outreach efforts with the list of about 250 people and organizations who signed up to be notified about dioxin at a series of meetings held by the city of Oakland. To supplement that list, we asked labor, environmental, community and industry representatives, and Task Force members, to recommend additions. This resulted in about 600 more names being added.

In January, we convened a series of three small meetings with Task Force members and representatives of labor, industry and environmental and community groups. The Task Force chose to hold three separate meetings so that each constituency would feel heard, and not intimidated or silenced by opposing views. Approximately 20 members of the public attended those three meetings in total, plus several Task Force members at each meeting. The meeting with the lowest turnout was the labor meeting, even though we did extensive outreach to all labor groups on the list including faxing and individual phone calls. Labor also did not attend the public meeting, despite similar outreach efforts.

About six weeks before the scheduled April 26, 2001 public meeting, we sent a brochure describing the Project and giving the date of the public meeting to the 850 people on the mailing list. We followed up with phone calls to many groups asking if they wanted to meet with us, describing the process and encouraging them to attend the public meeting.

Staff members of the Center for Environmental Health, the ABAG Dioxins Project Task Force, and TDC Environmental had individual discussions with all who request such meetings. Meetings were held with:

- Craig Johns (Partnership for Sound Science in Environmental Policy), Fred Krause (Vinyl Institute), John Marshall (Chlorine Chemistry Council) and Jay Murray (Murray and Associates)
- Eric Zell of Zell and Associates (a Contra Costa business group), with Jim Jakel (former Martinez City Manager), Dino Hair (Chevron, Contra Costa City Council, Manufacturing Task Force), Peter McGraw (attorney, Archer-Morris, chair of Contra Costa Environmental Task Force)

- California Zero Dioxin Alliance (a community and environmental group), including Bradley Angel and Sue Chiang (Greenaction), Karleen Lloyd (People United for a Better Oakland), Catherine Porter (Women's Cancer Resource Center), Greg Karras (Communities for a Better Environment), and Davis Baltz (Commonweal)
- Herbert Estreicher, (Pentachlorophenol Trade Association)
- Dennis Bolt, (Western States Petroleum Association- WSPA), Kevin Buchanon (WSPA), Brent Finley (Exponent), Fred Krause (Vinyl Institute), John Marshall (Chlorine Chemistry Council), Jay Murray (Murray and Associates)
- Our many phone conversations included such groups as La Leche League, Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition, and SEIU Local 250.

One week before the April 26th meeting, we sent a reminder postcard to the entire list, and followed up with dozens of phone calls. We contacted community-based organizations, labor and industry groups, environmental groups, and several elected officials, including State Assembly Members, Board and staff of the Air District, and Oakland, San Francisco and Alameda City Council Members.

II. The Public Meeting and Written Comments Submitted

On April 26, 2001, more than 30 members of the public and 12 Task Force members attended the public meeting. Eighteen members of the public spoke. Indicators of a successful meeting were:

- the meeting was well attended by the Task Force and the public
- everyone who wanted to speak had a chance (some twice)
- attendees respected each speaker and did not interrupt each other
- the Task Force heard diverse and valuable opinions on the Project
- the room set-up was conducive to a productive meeting and there were no technical glitches
- many constituencies were represented in the people who spoke.

Comments on the Public Participation Process.

Members of the public who submitted comments on the public participation process were mainly concerned with the closed-door nature of Task Force decisionmaking. Since then, the Task Force has decided to open meetings to the public, with a public comment period before and after the meeting. The web site has also been updated to include more substantial information for public review. Both of these developments should allay some of the public's concerns about the transparency of the decisionmaking process.

Comments on Project Selection by Local Governments.

Many commenters praised the Task Force for taking steps to reduce dioxins in the Bay Area. The most frequently submitted comments concern, in order: (1) encouragement to move quickly to finalize the TDC draft report and choose a pilot project; (2) encouragement to act on dioxin reduction, not conduct more studies; (3) the national significance of the project and (4) emphasizing that the goal of the project is dioxin prevention and elimination, not reduction. Many speakers suggested pilot projects, with heavy emphasis on educating hospitals about medical waste management and PVC reduction.

A compilation of public comments related to the Project process itself is attached as a chart.

III. Next Steps

We feel that the project is moving along well, and is generally well received by the public. To keep up the momentum, CEH recommends:

- Task Force: continue to have open meetings
- Task Force: expedite draft finalization, project selection, and implementation of pilot project(s) to the best extent possible
- Executive Board: distribute final document widely to constituencies and encourage local municipality to act on dioxins.

Attachment 3
Bay Area Dioxins Project Work Plan
FY Year (2001/2002)

Funding (as of 5/31/01) - \$183,000

PBT Grant - remaining funds \$55,000 + new \$50,000 = \$105,000

Community Liaison Grant - remaining funds \$39,000

Task Force Dues (billed \$39,000, rec'd \$13,000)

ABAG (\$67,100)

Tasks:

- Convening Task Force
- Convening meetings with other regulatory agencies and/or interested parties
- Administering grants – project tracking, contracting, reporting
- Writing new grants
- Developing and/or coordinating documents/policies/ strategies for task force
- Reporting to Executive Board, and funders
- Dissemination of Task Force information to interested parties (web site, conferences, etc.)

Technical Consultants TDC and LWA (\$76,900)

Tasks

- Finalize Screening Evaluation
- Draft Implementation Plans
- Assistance with local plan implementation
- Evaluation of p2 projects
- Case studies
- Support to task force on technical issues

Public Outreach Consultant CEH (\$39,000)

Tasks

- Advise task force on public outreach efforts to build support for P2 projects
- Maintain data base of interested parties
- Public outreach materials